

## Testimony on State Bill 5653

Dear Committee Members:

I oppose State Bill 5653 on the following points.

- 1) All ammunition and firearms are already taxed TWICE! First, enacted in 1937 The Pittman-Robertson fund is supplied by a 10% to 11% excise tax on **the manufacture of firearms, ammunition, archery equipment, and other sporting goods**. States use their P-R funds to **restore, manage, and enhance wild birds and mammals and their habitat**. (It is critical to note that this tax is not levied on the purchaser, but on the manufacturer, however those taxes are passed on to us because they are embedded in the cost to the retailer.) Second, the 6.35% state sales tax is added at the retailer. ***Combined we are taxed 16.35 - 17.35%!***
- 2) Looking at the LEAST expensive .22 Long Rifle Rimfire ammo (as listed by Bass Pro Shops, Bridgeport) of \$129.99 for a bucket of 1,400 rounds, or \$0.09285 each, the proposed tax of \$0.02 works out to a tax rate of **21.5%**! Similarly the LEAST expensive 9mm Centerfire ammo (the most common caliber, also at BPS) is \$19.99 for a box of 50 rounds, or \$0.3998 each, the proposed tax of \$0.05 works out to a tax rate of **12.5%**! If these rates were proposed on ANY OTHER products, there would be huge protests.
- 3) Therefore, combining points 1 & 2, this law would end up producing a final tax rate for centerfire ammo of **28.85 - 29.85%** and for rimfire of **37.85 - 38.85%**! This is outrageous for Citizens simply exercising their Second Amendment Right !
- 4) The plan to use this money to fund plans to reduce gun violence is punishing the law-abiding citizen for the illegal actions of the non-law-abiding criminals, many of whom serve little or no time for their actions and very rarely pay any fines. (History shows criminals are never charged under CT Law Sections 53-202 (h), (i) and (j) which require mandatory sentences for gun crimes).
- 5) Connecticut just received \$2,100,000 in Federal Funds exactly for the purpose of reducing crimes committed with guns before any specific plans have been proposed, so the funds required are not yet known. This law would just be setting up an ongoing stream of funds for *unspecified TBD projects* (and past CT history shows some of these funds would end up in the General Fund).

In sum, I urge the committee to reject this egregious tax proposal.

Sincerely,

Harding Dies  
Norwalk